

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.33141 of 2019

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-148 Year-2019 Thana- BEUR District- Patna

=====

CHANDAN KUMAR DEEP @ CHANDAN KUMAR Son of Anil Kumar @
Anil Prasad Resident of Mohalla- Krishna Bihar Colony, Near Devi Mandir,
Police Station- Beur District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. THE STATE OF BIHAR The State of Bihar
2. Suman Priya Wife of Chandan Kumar Deep @ Chandan Kumar, Daughter of Vijay Shankar Prasad Resident of Mohalla- Krishna Bihar Colony, Near Devi Mandir, Police Station- Beur, District- Patna at present C/o Tripurari Nath Verma Mohalla- Salimpur Ahara, Post Office- Kadam Kuan, Police Station- Kadam Kuan, District- Patna, Pin Code-800003.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ram Naresh Ray
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Atul Chandra

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

9 26-10-2021 Heard learned counsels for the petitioner and the

State.

Petitioner apprehends arrest in connection with

Beur P.S. Case No. 148 of 2019 registered for the offence

punishable under sections 498A, 307/34 of the Indian Penal

Code.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner

submits that petitioner, who is husband of the informant, has

been falsely implicated in this case due to village politics. As

a matter of fact, informant always quarrels with the petitioner

for transferring the house in her name. The allegation of

firing is absolutely false as no such occurrence ever took place. Petitioner is still ready to keep his wife with full honour and dignity. Petitioner has no criminal antecedent.

Learned Addl. P.P. appearing for the State opposes the prayer for bail and submits that there is specific allegation against the petitioner of attempt to murder by firing. Moreover, petitioner being the husband of the informant had the responsibility of keeping her with full honour and dignity, in which he failed. Petitioner, therefore, does not deserve to be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

Considering the nature of allegations levelled, the materials available on record and the submissions advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court does not find it to be a fit case for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The same is, therefore, rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

mcv/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--